

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	A	TTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,462	05/08/2001	Peter Staats		L-F / 207US	3615
26875 7.	26875 7590 03/23/2006			EXAMINER	
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP 2700 CAREW TOWER				MANTIS MERCADER, ELENI M	
441 VINE STR			. [ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CINCINNATI,	OH 45202	•		3737	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Commence	09/851,462	STAATS ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Eleni Mantis Mercader	3737		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Fe	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 February 2006</u> .			
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the formula of the following of behild in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing (s) is object to be in the formula of the drawing of the formula of the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) N Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/851,462

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Critchlow et al.'555 in view of Kormos et al.'285 and Ziaratti'544 (US Patent No. 5,432,544).

Regarding claims 1, 3-7 Critchlow et al.'555 teach a power injector system and a method for use with a magnetic resonance imaging system installed at least in part within an electromagnetic interference shielded room electrically accessible via a penetration panel (in Figure 1, scanner room 115 which is electrically accessible via penetration panel 142 also see paragraph 0014), the power injector system comprising: a power head adapted for operation within the shielded room to controllably inject a compound into a patient (see paragraph 0030 and paragraphs 0042-0045; referring to the components of the injector including the power being enclosed in a Faraday cage 137 in order to shield and reduce EMI noise) and a control panel 110 as indicated in Figure 1 to control the injection process by signals transmitted through the fiber optic 140 (see 0038).

Critchlow et al.'555 do not teach a power supply for operation outside the shielded room to receive utility electrical power; and a power connection configured to couple electrical power

Application/Control Number: 09/851,462

Art Unit: 3737

•

through the penetration panel between the power supply outside of the shielded room and the power head for actuating the power head.

In the same field of endeavor, Kormos et al.'285 teach the use of shielded spaces to enclose the equipment of choice in the MRI shielded room (see col. 5, lines 27-56). Kormos et al.'285 further teach the modification of using a remote power supply with a coupled shielded wire thereby removing the power from the MRI room in order to reduce EMI noise (see col. 6, lines 9-33).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to have modified Critchlow et al.'555 in view of Kormos et al.'285 to incorporate the use of a remote power supply with a shielded wire instead of an enclosed power supply as an alternative way of reducing EMI noise.

Critchlow et al.'555 further teach a power control adapted for operation within the shielded room interposed between the power supply and the power head, the power control operable to selectively actuate the power head with power received via the power connection from the power supply (see paragraphs 0033-0034 and referring to the power drive card 230).

Both the Critchlow et al.'555 and the Kormos et al.'285 references teach the fiber optic cable for providing control signals, and as stated in Kormos et al.'285 col. 6, lines 30-33, this is to allow for better transmission of the signals without degradation of data over long distances.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made that over short distances the use of shielded cables are equivalent to fiberoptics and one

Application/Control Number: 09/851,462

Art Unit: 3737

1

skilled in the art would be motivated to use one instead of the other as a functional equivalent providing the same end result of signal and/or power transmission.

Critchlow et al.'555 and the Kormos et al.'285 do not explicitly teach the power connection comprising a radio frequency filter reducing radio frequency electrical energy carried through said power connection.

In the same field of endeavor, Ziarati'544 teach the use of cables passing through RF filters disposed in a penetration panel to prevent RF noise from external rooms propagating into the magnet room in order to avoid adversely affecting the image quality (see col. 3, lines 34-41).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to have modified Critchlow et al.'555 and the Kormos et al.'285 and incorporated the teaching of Ziarati'544 in order to use RF filters in the penetration panel to prevent RF noise from interfering with image quality. Also note Applicant's own admission as prior art in Figure 1 wherein such filters are used when outside cables penetrate the MRI room.

Regarding claim 2, with respect to the use of a power connection, which is coupled to the data signals thereby creating a single connection, it is a well established principle in the art of electronics that a single cable is preferred over multiple cables to avoid noise. Thereby, the Examiner takes official notice of this fact.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni Mantis Mercader whose telephone number is (571) 272-4740. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri., 8:00 a.m.-6:30 p.m..

Art Unit: 3737

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eleni Mantis Mercader Primary Examiner Art Unit 3737

EMM